

Date of Hearing: April 18, 2023

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WATER, PARKS, AND WILDLIFE

Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Chair

AB 1567 (Garcia) – As Amended April 7, 2023

**SUBJECT:** Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparation, Flood Protection, Extreme Heat Mitigation, and Workforce Development Bond Act of 2024

**SUMMARY:** Places a \$15.105 billion climate resilience bond before the voters on the March 5, 2024, Primary Election ballot. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Places this \$15.105 billion bond issue before voters on the March 5, 2024, Primary Election ballot.
- 2) Provides that state agencies distributing bond funds pursuant to this bill shall give preference to projects that do any of the following:
  - a) Reduce near-term impacts while promoting long-term resilience;
  - b) Promote equity, foster community resilience, and protect the most vulnerable by prioritizing projects that meaningfully benefit disadvantaged communities (DAC), severely disadvantaged communities (SDAC), and vulnerable populations;
  - c) Avoid solutions that would likely worsen climate impacts or transfer risks unreasonably from one area, location, or social group to another;
  - d) Advance solutions to prevent displacement of low-income residents and businesses that could occur as a result of increased property values; and
  - e) Incorporate partnerships with community stakeholders.
- 3) Provides that all funds made available by this bill are subject to appropriation by the Legislature.
- 4) Authorizes \$2.18 billion for the prevention and reduction in the risk of wildfires to lives, properties, and natural resources. \$300 million of this amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$1.88 billion is allocated as follows:
  - a) \$400 million to the Office of Emergency Services (OES) for a pre-hazard mitigation grant program for local agencies, state agencies, joint powers authorities (JPA), or tribes;
  - b) \$150 million to the Department of Conservation (DOC) for its Regional Fire and Forest Capacity Program;
  - c) \$250 million to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) for long-term forest health projects;
  - d) \$150 million to the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) for watershed improvement projects in forests and other habitats;

- e) \$75 million to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy for watershed improvement, forest health, biomass utilization, and forest restoration workforce development;
  - f) \$150 million to CAL FIRE for its Wildfire Prevention Program;
  - g) \$30 million to the Air Resources Board for biomass projects that maximize greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions;
  - h) \$100 million to the Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) to reduce risks of fire to the state park system;
  - i) \$100 million to CNRA for regional park entities, including tribes, to restore or protect public lands and improve carbon sequestration;
  - j) \$350 million to CNRA for block grants to city, county, and regional park and open-space entities for projects that reduce risk of fire, flood, or drought, enhance water conservation, or promote access; and
  - k) \$125 million to the California Conservation Corps and certified community conservation corps for demonstrated jobs projects that provide specified climate benefits.
- 5) Authorizes \$1.925 billion for protection of coastal communities, restoration of coastal and ocean resources, mitigation of ocean acidification, and addressing the impacts of climate change along California's coast. \$300 million of this amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$1.625 billion is allocated as follows:
- a) \$1.1 billion to the Coastal Conservancy to protect, restore, and increase the resilience of beaches, bays, coastal dunes, wetlands, coastal forests, watersheds, trails, and public access facilities. \$250 million of this amount shall be for projects consistent with the San Francisco Bay Authority Act and \$250 million shall be for the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program.
  - b) \$30 million to the California Coastal Commission for local adaptation planning and updating local coastal programs;
  - c) \$20 million to the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission for coastal planning projects;
  - d) \$300 million to the California Ocean Protection Trust Fund for projects consistent with the mission of the Ocean Protection Council;
  - e) \$50 million to State Parks for projects to reduce the risks of sea level rise to state parks;
  - f) \$50 million to the Invasive Species Council to protect and restore island ecosystems and prevent island invasive species;
  - g) \$25 million to the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) for climate-ready fisheries approaches; and
  - h) \$50 million to DFW for management of kelp ecosystems.

- 6) Authorizes \$5.015 billion for safe drinking water, drought preparation and response, and flood protection. \$1.320 billion of this amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$3.695 billion is allocated as follows:
  - a) \$250 million to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) for implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act;
  - b) \$200 million for projects consistent with an adopted integrated regional water management plan;
  - c) \$400 million to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) for projects to provide clean, safe, and reliable drinking water to all Californians;
  - d) \$100 million to the State Water Board for projects to reduce contamination of drinking water supplies and improve access to wastewater infrastructure;
  - e) \$100 million to the State Water Board for project that reduce groundwater contamination;
  - f) \$450 million to CNRA for protection and restoration of rivers, lakes, and streams including \$240 million for the Salton Sea, \$50 million for the Tijuana River Border Pollution Control Project, and \$50 million for the Los Angeles River;
  - g) \$50 million to the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) for the New River Water Quality, Public Health, and River Parkway Development Program;
  - h) \$200 million to DWR for multiple-benefit flood management system improvements that reduce flood risk and provide fish and wildlife habitat including \$50 million for urban coastal watersheds and \$50 million for Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) levees;
  - i) \$400 million to DWR for projects to repair or expand facilities that are part of the State Plan of Flood Control;
  - j) \$200 million to DWR for the Flood Control Subventions Program;
  - k) \$150 million to DWR for projects in the Delta to increase flood protection and climate resiliency;
  - l) \$300 million to the State Water Board for water recycling projects;
  - m) \$25 million to DWR for implementation of the Open and Transparent Water Data Act;
  - n) \$100 million to the State Water Board to address hexavalent chromium in drinking water systems with high compliance costs, as specified;
  - o) \$70 million to the State Water Board for drinking waters systems to address perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS);
  - p) \$100 million to DWR to reactivate existing steam gauges and deploy new gauges;
  - q) \$250 million to the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) for the Stream Flow Enhancement Program;

- r) \$200 million for tribal water infrastructure projects; and
  - s) \$150 million to CNRA for multibenefit flood projects in urbanized areas.
- 7) Authorizes \$1.625 billion for the protection and restoration of natural lands to as to maintain diversity, preserve fish and wildlife, and allow species migration in response to climate conditions. \$185 million of this amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$1.44 billion is allocated as follows:
- a) \$750 million to WCB for the protection of fish and wildlife in response to changing climate conditions;
  - b) \$100 million to DOC for the Multibenefit Land Repurposing Program for groundwater sustainability projects that provide wildlife habitat;
  - c) \$50 million to DFW for projects to improve climate resilience of fish and wildlife;
  - d) \$540 million for climate resilience of communities, fish and wildlife, and natural resources as follows:
    - i) \$15 million to the Baldwin Hills Conservancy;
    - ii) \$40 million to the Coastal Conservancy's Santa Ana River Conservancy Program;
    - iii) \$30 million to the Coastal Conservancy's Coyote Valley Conservation Program;
    - iv) \$10 million to the Coastal Conservancy;
    - v) \$35 million to the California Tahoe Conservancy;
    - vi) \$30 million to the Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy;
    - vii) \$35 million to the Delta Conservancy;
    - viii) \$50 million to the San Diego River Conservancy;
    - ix) \$65 million to the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy;
    - x) \$15 million to the San Joaquin River Conservancy;
    - xi) \$65 million to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy;
    - xii) \$15 million to the American River Conservancy; and
    - xiii) \$70 million for the creation of new conservancies, including \$15 million for a Salton Sea Conservancy and \$25 million for a California Trails Conservancy.
- 8) Authorizes \$820 million for the protection of California's agricultural resources, communities, open spaces, and lands from climate change impacts. \$300 million of this

amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$520 million is allocated as follows:

- a) \$100 million to the Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) to improve soil health, carbon sequestration, air or water quality, or fish and wildlife habitat;
  - b) \$50 million to CDFA for on-farm water use efficiency;
  - c) \$80 million to CDFA for projects that reduce methane emissions from dairy and livestock operations and that improve water quality;
  - d) \$20 million for to CDFA for projects and activities recommended by the Invasive Species Council of California;
  - e) \$10 million to CDFA for pollinator habitat and forage;
  - f) \$100 million to CDFA for grants that benefit small- and medium-sized farms and socially disadvantaged farmers and increase the sustainability of agricultural infrastructure;
  - g) \$100 million to DOC for the protection and restoration of farm and ranch land;
  - h) \$10 million to WCB for recovering and sustaining populations of monarch butterflies and other pollinators; and
  - i) \$50 million to CDFA for a resilient and higher welfare grant program to support improved farm animal welfare.
- 9) Authorizes \$1.74 billion for climate resilience and mitigation strategies to address increasing temperatures and extreme heat. \$300 million of this amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$1.44 billion is allocated as follows:
- a) \$850 million to State Parks for the Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Program (Statewide Park Program);
  - b) \$175 million to CNRA for urban greening projects that benefit vulnerable populations;
  - c) \$150 million to CAL FIRE for urban forestry projects;
  - d) \$75 million to the Department of Community Services and Development for the Energy Efficiency Low-Income Weatherization Program;
  - e) \$150 million to the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) to reduce the urban heat island effect and other extreme heat impacts; and
  - f) \$40 million to CNRA to provide fuel breaks, risk reduction buffers, and recreational corridors through the Recreational Trails and Greenways Grant Program.
- 10) Authorizes \$1.8 billion to strengthen climate resilience based on regional needs. \$255 million of this amount is not allocated for a specific purpose; the remaining \$1.55 billion is allocated as follows:

- a) \$1 billion to SGC for climate resilience and the reduction of climate risk to communities;
  - b) \$200 million to SGC for the Transformative Climate Communities Program;
  - c) \$100 million to SGC for multijurisdictional projects led by countywide special districts created for the purpose of building resiliency to the impacts of sea level rise and extreme storms;
  - d) \$100 million to OES for grants to create strategically located climate resilience centers;
  - e) \$100 million to CDFA for grants to fairgrounds to enhance their ability to serve as community staging and evacuation centers, including deployment of communications and broadband; and
  - f) \$50 million to the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to provide funding for organic waste infrastructure.
- 11) Provides that up to 5% of the funds may be used for program administration.
- 12) Requires that at least 35% of the funds made available by this bill shall provide direct and meaningful benefits to either a vulnerable population, under-resourced community, or DAC and that at least 10% of the funds shall be for projects that provide direct and meaningful benefits to SDACs.
- 13) Provides that up to 10% of the funds may be used for technical assistance and capacity building. This amount may exceed 10% if the administering agency determines it is necessary for a DAC, SDAC, under-resourced community, or vulnerable population.
- 14) Provides that up to 5% of the funds may be used for ongoing monitoring and scientific review.
- 15) Provides that funds may not be used for any mitigation costs associated with Delta conveyance facilities.
- 16) Requires grant administering agencies to adopt project solicitation and evaluation guidelines and seek public input in their development.
- 17) Defines various terms for the purposes of this bill, including:
- a) DAC as a community with a median household income that is less than 80% of the statewide median;
  - b) SDAC as a community with a median household income that is less than 60% of the statewide median;
  - c) "Tribe" as a federally recognized Native American tribe or a California Native American tribe that appears on the California Tribal Consultation List maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission.
  - d) "Under-resourced community" as a DAC identified by CalEnviro Screen or a census tract with median household incomes at or below 80% of statewide average or below

thresholds designated by the Department of Housing and Community and Development;  
and

- e) “Vulnerable population” as a subgroup of a population within a region or community that faces a disproportionately heightened risk or increased sensitivity to impacts of climate change and that lacks adequate resources to adapt to or recover from such impacts.

18) Provides that bonds authorized pursuant to the Act shall be prepared, executed, issued, sold, paid, and redeemed consistent with the General Obligation Bond Law except provisions that require bond funds to only be used to fund or provide grants or loans for capital outlay projects.

19) States legislative findings and declarations regarding the climate crisis and the threat it poses to Californians, particularly to low-income communities and communities of color.

#### **EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Provides that the Legislature cannot authorize the sale of general obligation bonds in excess of \$300,000 without a two-third’s vote of the Legislature and the approval of a majority of the voters at primary or general election (California Constitution, Article XVI, § 1).
- 2) Specifies the procedure to authorize, issue, prepare and sell general obligation bonds and places limits on the use of bond funds under the General Obligation Bond Law (Government Code, § 16720 *et seq.*).

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown. This bill is keyed fiscal.

#### **COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Purpose of this bill.** According to the author, “the impacts of climate change to our state and our communities require us to act quickly. California needs to protect itself against future climate disasters and rebuild our workforce from an ongoing pandemic that has shown us what can happen when we aren't prepared for an emergency. This bill seeks to make California more climate resilient by investing in various adaptation activities throughout the state, ranging from wildfire risk reduction, to drought preparation, to protection against sea-level rise. Not only will this measure help create new jobs for Californians, it will create long-term green jobs that help the state reach its climate goals. We must invest in the infrastructure necessary to protect our communities, our environment, and our economy from an evolving climate crisis.”
- 2) **Background.** California is increasingly experiencing the impacts of climate change. These impacts include sea level rise, increased severity and frequency of wildfire, changes in precipitation that increase the risk of both drought and flooding, and increases in temperatures that can affect air quality, public health, and habitat. California’s experience with its wildfire season over the past decade is one jarring example of this phenomenon. The 2020 wildfire season was the largest on record with nearly 10,000 fires that burned more than 4.2 million acres or over 4% of California’s land mass. This is after California had recently broken wildfire records in 2018 with 1.8 million acres burned and in 2017 with 1.3 million acres burned.

Likewise, California experienced its worst drought on record from 2012 through 2016 and just ended a three-year drought (2020-22) this winter that was nearly as severe as the previous drought. Research published in 2020 suggests that both of these droughts are part of a larger “megadrought” that began in 2000 and that is the second worst the Southwestern United States has experienced in the last 1200 years. This research estimates that 46% of this megadrought’s severity is due to climate change, making what would have been a moderate drought a severe one.

*Fourth Climate Change Assessment (Assessment).* Led by state agencies and completed in 2018, the Assessment includes over 44 peer-reviewed technical reports that examine specific aspects of climate change in California. Among the Assessment’s findings is that California is one of the most “climate-challenged” regions of North America and must actively plan and implement strategies to prepare for and adapt to extreme events and shifts in previously “normal” averages. The report stated that climate change impacts are here, including the following impacts: 1) temperatures are warming, heat waves are more frequent, and precipitation has become increasingly variable; 2) glaciers in the Sierra Nevada have lost an average of 70% of their area since the start of the 20th century; and 3) the sea level along the central and southern California coast has risen more than 5.9 inches over the 20th century. The Assessment projects that climate change impacts could result in direct economic costs exceeding \$100 billion annually by 2050. Human mortality due to high temperatures is the single largest projected cost at approximately \$50 billion annually. A “megaflood” in the Central Valley would not be an annual cost, but climate change will increase the likelihood of such an event and it could cost up to \$750 billion in damages. Similarly, sea-level rise could lead to as much as \$18 billion in damages. The increased likelihood and severity of a 100-year storm hitting the coast combined with sea level rise could result in costs of \$30 billion.

*Investment need?* The Assessment indicates that costs of climate change impacts to California will be exorbitant; however, while it offers some ideas about adaptation strategies, it does not discuss the investment needed to implement these strategies and make California more climate resilient. The *Safe Guarding California Plan, 2018 Update* goes into greater detail about strategies for climate resilience by sector and level of government; nevertheless, it also provides little insight into the investment needed to achieve climate resiliency. The *Pathways to 30x30 California* report shows that roughly 24% of California is already protected and identifies a need to protect an additional six million acres of land and 500,000 acres of coastal waters in order to achieve the 30% protected goal, but the report does not estimate the cost of this effort.

Other reports, not specifically looking at climate change impacts, do identify investment need. The *Central Valley Flood Protection Plan, 2022 Update* identifies an investment need of \$25 billion to \$30 billion over the next 30 years; this includes an annual need of \$315 million to \$390 million for routine activities. For drinking water, the State Water Board completed an update to its *Drinking Water Needs Assessment* in 2022. The “Drought Infrastructure Cost Assessment” identifies a statewide need of between \$1.2 billion and \$4.8 billion to make small water systems more resilient to drought. This is on top of a \$2.3 billion to \$9.1 billion capital investment need identified by the 2021 *Drinking Water Needs Assessment* to ensure that small and at risk public water systems are providing safe and reliable drinking water to their customers.



*General obligation bonds.* General obligation bonds are debt that is secured by the General Fund; the debt service on bonds issued by the state must be paid on an annual basis. Fully paying off a bond issue can take decades (sometimes 30+ years). Bonds issued by the State of California are able to obtain favorable financing because interest on these bonds is tax exempt (i.e., investors are willing to offer lower financing rates because they do not pay income tax on gains from their investment).

Per the California Constitution, voters must approve general obligation bonds in excess of \$300,000. There are two pathways to the ballot for general obligation bonds that exceed this \$300,000 threshold: 1) through an act of the Legislature; and, 2) via the citizens’ initiative process.

*What can bonds be used for?* Typically, general obligation bond are used to pay for public benefits derived from planning, constructing, and renovating infrastructure including dams, bridges, prisons, parks, schools, and buildings. The General Obligation Bond Law provides that bonds can only be used to pay for or provide grants or loans for the construction or acquisition of “capital assets” and defines “capital assets” as “tangible physical property with an expected useful life of 15 years or more,” major maintenance necessary between 5 to 15 years to extend the useful life of a “capital asset,” or equipment with an expected useful life greater than 2 years [Government Code, Section 16727(a) and (b)]. Because of these restrictions on the use of bond funds, and others in federal law governing tax exempt bonds, the state typically uses bonds to pay for projects that provide benefits over many years as opposed to paying for ongoing operations and maintenance costs. While this bill exempts itself from Government Code, Section 16727(a) and (b) of the General Obligation Bond Law (as have previous water and natural resource bonds), in practice, bond funds are only used for purposes that have long-term, public benefits.

*Previous natural resource and water bonds.* Since the mid-1990’s, California voters have authorized the state to take on more than \$30 billion in general obligation bond debt to fund various water, natural resource, and flood protection programs:

<b>Year</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Ballot Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Election Result</b>	<b>Type</b>
2018	3	Authorizes Bonds to Fund Projects for Water Supply and Quality, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Water Conveyances, and Groundwater Sustainability and Storage.	\$8.9 billion	Fail	citizen’s initiative
2018	68	Authorizes Bonds Funding Parks, Natural Resources Protection, Climate Adaptation, Water Quality and Supply, and Flood Protection.	\$4 billion	Pass	legislative

2014	1	Water Bond. Funding For Water Quality, Supply, Treatment, And Storage Projects.	\$7.1 billion	Pass	legislative
2006	1E	Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006.	\$4.1 billion	Pass	legislative
2006	84	Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, Natural Resource Protection, Park Improvements.	\$5.4 billion	Pass	citizen's initiative
2002	40	The California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002.	\$2.6 billion	Pass	legislative
2002	50	Water Quality, Supply and Safe Drinking Water Projects. Coastal Wetlands Purchase and Protection.	\$3.4 billion	Pass	citizen's initiative
2000	12	Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000.	\$2.1 billion	Pass	legislative
2000	13	Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection, and Flood Protection Bond Act.	\$2 billion	Pass	legislative
1996	204	Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act	\$1 billion	Pass	legislative

*How much is left?* According to CNRA's bond accountability web site ([www.bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov](http://www.bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov)), approximately \$40 million from Proposition 1 and \$145.4 million of Proposition 68 remain uncommitted. This does not necessarily mean all of the other bond funds have been expended as the majority of grant programs operate on a reimbursement basis so that a grant recipient does not receive the public funding until it has completed the work in the grant agreement, but it is important that the vast majority of the funds allocated by the previous two resources and water bonds are committed to projects at this point. The Treasurer's Office reports monthly on bond balances and this gives some more insight into how much of the bond allocation has actually been spent; according to the March 2023 "Authorized and Outstanding General Obligation Bonds," \$4.95 billion from Proposition 1 and \$3.2 billion from Proposition 68 remain "unissued."

- 3) **Arguments in support.** A number of nongovernmental organizations and local agencies support this bill arguing that the impacts of climate change that California is already experiencing warrant significant investment in climate resilience and adaptation. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) asserts "the need for statewide investment to increase the resilience of communities and natural systems is greater than ever before." TNC points to California's recent experience with drought, flooding, heat waves, and catastrophic wildfire as clear

evidence that more investment is needed to keep pace with the scale of change occurring. Further, TNC points to the budget deficit of at least \$22.5 billion and the related cuts to natural resource and climate spending as another compelling case for this bill: “These cuts clearly demonstrate that California needs a climate bond and accompanying disciplined investment plan as a down payment to address growing challenges in managing natural resources for the benefit of all Californians.” TNC maintains that this bill will accomplish this and make California more climate resilient.

- 4) **Proposed committee amendment.** This bill’s stated intent is to drive more equitable outcomes for vulnerable communities and to create job opportunities. The Committee may wish to consider providing stronger policy direction to do so. The following amendments will help achieve this policy goal:

**Amendment 1** – amend Public Resources Code, Section 80500 (e) as follows:

(e) To the extent practicable, a project that receives moneys pursuant to this division shall provide workforce education and training, contractor, and job opportunities for vulnerable populations *or socially disadvantaged groups*.

**Amendment 2** – add definition of “Socially disadvantaged group” to Public Resources Code, Section 80503 as follows:

*“Socially disadvantaged group” means a group whose members have been subjected to racial, ethnic, or gender prejudice because of their identity as members of a group without regard to their individual qualities. These groups include all of the following:*

*(1) African Americans.*

*(2) Tribes.*

*(3) Alaskan Natives.*

*(4) Hispanics.*

*(5) Asian Americans.*

*(6) Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders.*

*(7) Women.*

Appropriately-designed and scaled desalination projects that utilize renewable energy to the extent feasible and incorporate measures to minimize impacts on the environment are an important to developing additional water supplies and making the state more climate resilient. The Committee may wish to consider amending this bill to ensure funding for these projects as follows:

**Amendment 3** – add Public Resources Code Section 80550.5 as follows:

*80550.5 (a) Of the funds made available by Section 80540, one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) shall be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for capital investments in brackish desalination, seawater desalination, contaminant and salt removal, and salinity management projects to improve California water and drought resilience. Priority shall be given to projects that use renewable energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with their construction and operation.*

*(b) For ocean desalination projects, priority shall be given to projects that do the following:*

(1) Incorporate measures to minimize the intake of all forms of marine, brackish, and freshwater life in their construction and operation.

(2) Incorporate measures to minimize the adverse impacts of outfalls on marine, brackish, and freshwater life in their construction and operation.

- 5) **Double-referral.** This bill is also referred to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee.
- 6) **Related legislation.** AB 2387 (Garcia) of 2022 would have placed a \$7.4 billion climate resilience bond on the November 8, 2022, General Election ballot. AB 2387 died in the Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

AB 897 (Mullin) of 2021 would have established requirements for the formation of regional climate networks and delineate a process for setting standards for regional adaptation actions plans developed by regional climate networks. AB 897 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1500 (Garcia) of 2021 would have placed a \$7.1 billion climate resilience bond on the June 7, 2022, Primary Election ballot. AB 1500 died in the Assembly Rules Committee.

SB 45 (Portantino) of 2021 would have placed a \$5.6 billion climate resilience bond on the November 8, 2022, General Election ballot. SB 45 was amended to address a different issue in 2022 and enacted into law as Chapter 445, Statutes of 2022.

AB 3256 (E. Garcia) of 2020 would have placed a \$6.98 billion climate resilience bond on the November 3, 2020, General Election ballot. AB 3256 died in the Assembly Rules Committee.

AB 1298 (Mullin) of 2019 would have placed a climate resilience bond on the November 3, 2020, General Election ballot. A total amount was not specified. AB 1298 died in this committee.

SB 45 (Allen) of 2019 would have placed a \$5.5 billion climate resilience bond on the November 3, 2020, General Election ballot. SB 45 died in the Assembly.

## **REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

### **Support**

Bear Yuba Land Trust  
 California Association of Local Conservation Corps  
 California Climate Reality Coalition  
 California Municipal Utilities Association  
 California Park & Recreation Society  
 California Urban Forests Council  
 City of Anaheim  
 City of Jurupa Valley  
 City of Riverside  
 County of Nevada  
 County of Orange

County of Placer  
County of Riverside  
County of San Bernardino  
East Bay Regional Park District  
Eastern Sierra Land Trust  
Feather River Land Trust  
IRWM Roundtable of Regions  
Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation  
Mojave Water Agency  
North Tahoe Public Utility District  
Placer Land Trust  
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority  
Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority  
Save Mount Diablo  
Self-Help Enterprises  
Sierra Business Council  
Sierra County Land Trust  
Sierra Foothill Conservancy  
Sierra Nevada Alliance  
Sonoma County Regional Parks  
State Council on Developmental Disabilities  
Tahoe City Public Utility District  
The Nature Conservancy  
The Wildlands Conservancy  
Truckee Donner Land Trust  
Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group

**Opposition**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Pablo Garza / W., P., & W. / (916) 319-2096